

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/658,726	Applicant(s) BUCO ET AL.	
	Examiner MENGYAO ZHE	Art Unit 2195	

All Participants:

 (1) MENGYAO ZHE.

(2) _____.

Status of Application: Pending

 (3) Vicky Ash.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1 July 2008
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103 rejections for claims 1, 7-11, 13, 14, 20-24 using Atif et al and Baker et al were discussed.

Claims discussed:

1, 7-11, 13-15, 20-24

Prior art documents discussed:

NPL: To Schedule or to Execute, by Atif et al and Baker et al, Pub. No. US 2005/0065826
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 1 is still unclear in terms of how the solutions found by different algorithms are used for scheduling and resource allocation purposes. Therefore, the Examiner proposed moving claims 7 and 8 up with claim 1, because these two dependent claims helps to clear up this issue. The applicant agreed with the proposal.